REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 2 and 4 have been amended. Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

The allowance of claims 1-3 is gratefully acknowledged. Claim 2 has been amended in minor fashion and remains in condition for allowance.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohmae (US 5,237,698). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 recites a method for supplying power to a CPU providing a power saving mode comprising "decreasing the output voltage to be a power saving level <u>after</u> decreasing the prescribed voltage detection value to be less than or equal to a power saving level when the power saving mode is set <u>such that the reset signal is not output when the power saving mode is being set</u>." (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Ohmae does not disclose these limitations.

Specifically, the cited portions of Ohmae merely disclose that an output voltage may be reduced and thus used as a power saving mode voltage level. In Ohmae, the reduced output voltage is used when the CPU enters the standby mode. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a standard/conventional means of setting power in a standby mode and is not what claim 4 recites.

Instead, the claimed invention does not generate a reset signal during the setting of the power saving mode. This is accomplished by decreasing the detection voltage level so the voltage detecting circuit does not determine that a reset voltage must be output. To do so, the detection voltage level must be lowered before lowering the output voltage level to the power saving mode level. Otherwise, the voltage detecting

6

circuit would generate and output the reset signal when it is not desirable to do so. These operations are simply not found in Ohmae.

Moreover, because Ohmae fails to lower the voltage detection level, Ohmae must also fail to disclose "recovering the prescribed voltage detection value after recovering the output voltage." This is one more reason why claim 4 is believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Since Ohmae does not disclose all the limitations of claim 4, claim 4 is not anticipated by Ohmae. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May _7_, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Thomas J. D'Amico
    Registration No.: 28,371
Gianni Minutoli
    Registration No.: 41,198
Rachael Lea Leventhal
    Registration No.: 54,266
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant